



# Children & Families Commission

202 Mira Loma Drive, Oroville, CA 95965 530.538.7964 Fax: 530.538.2165 Web: [ccfc.ca.gov/butte](http://ccfc.ca.gov/butte) Email: [cfc@buttecounty.net](mailto:cfc@buttecounty.net)

## Butte County Children and Families Commission (BCCFC)

### Special Meeting Agenda

**Friday, December 19, 2003 – 8:30 to 12:00 Noon**

Tahoe Room, 202 Mira Loma Drive, Oroville, CA

- Item 1 Introductions (8:30 – 8:45) ..... DISCUSSION
- Item 2 Funding Available for 2004 RFP (8:45 – 9:00) ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
The Contract Award Committee recommends that a decision be made to adopt and approve Funding Option B of the options presented by Analyst Eva Puciata. This option provides that the total funding of \$4,278,800.00 be diminished through recognition that \$477,588.00 has been allocated to the School Readiness Initiative over the next funding cycle. Further, that those monies already awarded for the fiscal year 2004/2005 in sustaining Project Reward be removed from the available pool of money in an amount of \$405,000.00. It is also recommended that the monies which would be remaining for fiscal year 2005/06 and 2006/07 not be placed in the available monies, but instead be held as continuance of Project REWARD has yet to be determined by the Commission.
- Item 3 Current Grantee Contract Amendment (9:00 – 9:15) ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
It is the recommendation of the Contract Award Committee, that those contractors, soon to begin their third year contracts, who will have large surpluses due to late or delayed start up, be allowed to extend their current contracts for an additional six months. This will provide that those contractors will be able to expend awarded funds in the most appropriate and productive manner. All contractors will be required to provide new and or amended budgets, clearly showing where those monies are to be expended. The budget will require realistic and clear line items. Further, the contractors will be required to submit a new or amended SOW justifying and explaining the request for extension of the contract.
- Item 4 Funding Policy Manual (9:15 – 10:00)  
The Contract Award Committee reviewed each of the proposed policies within the Funding Policy Manual. Recommendations are based on the merits of each individual policy. It is also recommended that the Special Funding Proposal Policy, previously approved by the Commission, be included in the approved Funding Policy Manual.
- A. Capitol Improvements Policy ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
This Policy would not permit the funding of any capital improvements affixed to real property. It is the recommendation of the Contract Award Committee that this proposed policy not be approved.
- B. Competitive Grant Eligibility ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
This proposed policy defines those persons or organizations who are eligible for grant application. It is the recommendation of the Contract Award Committee that this proposed policy be adopted.
- C. Vehicle Purchase Policy ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
Clarifies the requirements for funding vehicles. It is the recommendation of the Contract Award Committee that this policy be adopted with the modification that the title be changed to include the following "...and Capitol Improvement" Policy.
- D. Competitive Grants for Childcare ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
Defines the purposes for which funds may be granted for childcare. It is the recommendation of the Contract Award Committee that this proposed policy not be adopted or approved.
- E. Mini-Grant Policy for child Care ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION



This proposed policy set perimeters for funding of mini-grants for childcare. The recommendation of the Contract Award Committee is that this proposed policy not be adopted as it is a special carve out for funding category, which is covered in the funding allocation plan and the Strategic Plan, both already adopted.

- F. Property Purchased with Grant Funds ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
Sets guidelines for release of Commission ownership of property purchased with grant funds. Based on previous discussions with Counsel, it is the recommendation of the Contract Award Committee that this proposed policy not be approved or adopted.
- G. Grant Lapse Policy..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
This proposed policy sets a time limit of ninety days in which the parties awarded grants must enter into a contract and begin performance of the program, or the grant award will become null and void. The recommendation of the Contract Award Committee is that this proposed policy be adopted with a modification in language, which deletes the phrase "...of receiving notice of the grant selection," and inserts "...full execution of the contract."
- H. Multiple Mini-Grant Application..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
This proposed policy would prohibit funding for the same mini-grant more than one time in the same fiscal year. It is recommended by the Contract Award Committee that this proposed policy not be adopted.
- I. Real Property Purchase Policy..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
Would prohibit the purchase of real property using Prop 10 funding. It is recommended that this proposed policy be adopted in its entirety.
- J. Multiple Year Grant Policy..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
This proposed policy would set criteria for grant awards from one to three years. It is recommended that this proposed policy be adopted.
- K. Competitive Grant Funding Limit..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
This proposed policy would set a general rule that the same project would not be funded for more than three years, unless the Commission finds that extraordinary circumstances exist. It is recommended that this policy be adopted by the Commission as amended. The amendment would add the following language: "Currently funded Grantees may request a one-year extension for any remaining funds at the end of the third year contract through a letter of request that includes a financial report that indicates funds spent and remaining funds, new objectives and budget for the requested extension. Currently funded Grantees in the third year of funding may participate in competitive grant processes only to expand the currently funded grant objectives or propose a totally new project."
- L. Non-Supplanting Policy..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
Clarifies existing services and sets criteria for determining whether or not the awarding of funds would be in jeopardy of violating code on supplantation. It is recommended that the policy language be changed, incorporating language used in the previously proposed non-supplantation policy and that this policy be referred to the Administration Committee for recommendation.

BREAK

- Item 5 Adoption of DRAFT 2004 Request for Proposals (10:15-11:45) ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
Adoption of the DRAFT in its entirety also includes the follow specific items which should be addressed individually.
  - A. Categories One and Two..... DISCUSSION / ACTION  
It is recommended that there be the creation of two levels of applicants, those who are making application from BCCFC for the first time, and those who are reapplying for funding. There will be additional requirements for those applications that have been previously funded. Scoring differences for the two categories are also recommended.
  - B. Funding Levels..... DISCUSSION / ACTION

The following are recommended by the Grant Award Commission for approval by the Commission:

1. No change in one-year limits of up to \$100,000.00
2. For multi-year awards, first year limit up to \$100,000.00; second year limit up to \$100,000.00; third year limit up to \$75,000.00. Such a reduction during the third year would serve as evidence of effort to obtain sustainability.

### C. Rating Process

Noting that the process for rating applicants is an important issue, the following are recommended by the Contract Award Committee:

1. Recommended Stipend ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION

It is recommended that a stipend in the amount of \$200.00 per reader, with a possible additional stipend of \$25.00 for the one-day calibration be approved for each reader. The \$25.00 would be available only for those readers living outside of the Butte County area.

2. Process ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION

It is recommended that the readers be broken into teams, number to be determined in relation to the number of RFF's received. All readers on the same team would read the same RFF's, and score them individually. Those scores would be reported, via email or telephone, to Bobbi Dunivan. This reporting will provide an opportunity for staff to be alerted to any wide variances in scoring within a group. It is suggested that the readers are given up to three weeks to read all of the proposals assigned to them and to complete preliminary scoring. There would be a one-day calibration event, at which time final scores would be assigned to the individual applicants by each team. It is strongly recommended that during this day calibration, each group be assisted by a table "lead" who would provide guidance and answer questions. It is recommended that table lead positions be held by staff. In the event that there are not sufficient staff available, it is recommended that Commissioners act as leads.

- D. Letter of Intent – Category One or Two ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION

### Item 6 Membership of Contract Award Committee (11:45-12:00) ..... DISCUSSION / ACTION

At the last Commission meeting Commissioner Phyllis Murdock requested that she be a part of the Contract Award Committee. It is the tradition of this body that no more than four Commissioners sit on any Ad Hoc Committee to assure adherence to standards of the Brown Act. Additionally, past practices have seen that appointment to Committees is a decision of the Commission. During that meeting of November 21, 2003, Commissioner Karen Marlatt offered to step down from the Committee to allow Commissioner Murdock to take part in that portion of the Commission's work.

**PUBLIC INPUT IS INVITED DURING EACH AGENDA ITEM**

Note: Order and time of agenda items are subject to change